CORRESPONDENCE,

Copy of a letter from Littleton Dennis Teackle, Esquire, to Charles F. Mayer.

DEAR SIR:—The circumstance to which you alluded, when I saw you last, has been a source of deep vexation to me, as in the transaction referred to, I was most grossly deceived and imposed upon. The papers when delivered to the binder, were in perfect order, and comprised matter, for forty-two large volumes, including the National Intelligencer for more than nine years, and other principal periodicals in the most interesting annals of our history. It will be recollected that an extensive stock of the public journals had been a primary object of the joint committee, and the procuring of them, especially when obtainable in exchanges, had been desirable from the two-fold consideration, that the books given in exchange, would conduce to the more general diffusion of information and that the several departments of the government would profit by the augmented stock of useful knowledge derivable from those received in return. In the prosecution of this object, the works in question had been collected through much labour, and at a pecuniary expenditure of more than the value of those intended to be received for them—the former proprietor of one of the series, to wit, the National Intelligencer, assured me that he had been offered for that alone two hundred dollars.

After having from day to day, through several weeks vainly urged the binder, who had been employed by Mr. Coale to complete the job, I was compelled by the calls of my private affairs to leave the city—and to depend upon his solemn promise to finish the whole in a few days—but upon returning in June, I found that the order of the files had been deranged, at which, upon expressing my dissatisfaction in strong terms, he informed me that the apparent confusion of the papers had been the necessary consequence of an operation incident to the improved mode of execution which was in progress, and would proceed without delay. Nevertheless I was again deceived, and when I arrived here in the ensuing month it was discovered that the original contractor had absconded, and had left with a partner subsequently associated with him, a demand for immediate payment, although he had agreed to wait until the meet